

1 AARON D. FORD
2 Attorney General
3 HARRY B. WARD, Bar No. 11317
4 Deputy Attorney General
5 State of Nevada
6 Public Safety Division
7 100 N. Carson Street
Carson City, NV 89701-4717
Tel: (775) 684-1159
E-mail: hward@ag.nv.gov

8
9
Attorneys for Defendants
10 *Isidro Baca and Linda Fox*

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

12 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

13 HERIBERTO TORIBIO-RUIZ,
14 Plaintiff,
v.
ISIDRO BACA, *et al.*,
Defendants.

15 Case No. 3:17-cv-00674-MMD-CBC

16 **DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR
ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE A
DISPOSITIVE MOTION
(Second Request)**

17 Defendants, Isidro Baca and Linda Fox, by and through counsel, Aaron D. Ford, Attorney
18 General of the State of Nevada, and Harry B. Ward, Deputy Attorney General, hereby move this Court
19 for an order enlarging the time for Defendants to file dispositive motions. This Motion is made pursuant
20 to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure ("Fed. R. Civ. Proc.") 6(b) and is based upon the following Points
and Authorities and all pleadings and papers on file herein. This Motion is made in good faith and not
for the purposes of undue delay.

21 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

22 **I. RELEVANT FACTS AND PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

23 Plaintiff Heriberto Toribio-Ruiz ("Plaintiff") is a Nevada Department of Corrections ("NDOC")
24 inmate proceeding *pro se* in this § 1983 action for deliberate indifference to his serious medical needs.
25 Plaintiff is currently housed at Northern Nevada Correctional Center ("NNCC"). The Court allowed a
26 single claim for Eighth Amendment medical deliberate indifference to proceed against NNCC Pharmacist
27 Linda Fox ("Fox"), former NNCC Pharmacy Assistant Sunshine Flores ("Flores"), former NDOC Medical
28 Director Romeo Aranas ("Aranas"), and NNCC Warden Isidro Baca ("Baca"). (ECF No. 3 at 3.) The

1 claim is based on the allegations Plaintiff continually received his prescription pain medications late after
2 timely requesting refills at NNCC. (*Id.* at 3-5.) Plaintiff alleges the violations began occurring in 2015 and
3 are continuing through the present. (*Id.*)

4 After the parties were unable to settle this case at the Inmate Early Mediation Conference, (ECF
5 No. 21), and Defendants answered, (ECF No. 29), this Court issued its Scheduling Order. (ECF No. 30)
6 In the Scheduling Order, the Court ordered the parties to submit any motions for summary judgment by
7 July 17, 2019. (*Id.* at 3:25-28) Defendants were unable to comply with this deadline. Defendants
8 asserted they need additional time to respond because the Litigation Division of the Office of the Attorney
9 General was currently severely short-staffed. Defendant's asserted the burden placed on the attorneys
10 remaining in the division was overwhelming. Additionally, defense counsel, Heather Zana's last day with
11 the office was July 18, 2019.

12 Undersigned counsel recently accepted employed with the Litigation Division of the Office of the
13 Attorney General. Accordingly, Defendants respectfully request that this Honorable Court allow them
14 thirty (30) additional days, or up to and including Thursday, October 17, 2019, to file their dispositive
15 motion.

16 **II. LEGAL STANDARD**

17 District courts have inherent power to control their dockets. *Hamilton Copper & Steel Corp. v.*
18 *Primary Steel, Inc.*, 898 F.2d 1428, 1429 (9th Cir. 1990); *Oliva v. Sullivan*, 958 F.2d 272, 273 (9th Cir.
19 1992). Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b)(1) governs enlargements of time and provides as follows:

20 When an act may or must be done within a specified time, the court may,
21 for good cause, extend the time: (A) with or without motion or notice if
the court acts, or if a request is made, before the original time or its
22 extension expires; or (B) on motion made after the time has expired if the
party failed to act because of excusable neglect.

23
24 “The proper procedure, when additional time for any purpose is needed, is to present to the
Court a timely request for an extension before the time fixed has expired (*i.e.*, a request presented
25 before the time then fixed for the purpose in question has expired).” *Canup v. Miss. Valley Barge Line*
26 Co., 31 F.R.D. 282, 283 (D. Pa. 1962). The *Canup* Court explained that “the practicalities of life” (such
27 as an attorney’s “conflicting professional engagements” or personal commitments such as
28

1 vacations, family activities, illnesses, or death) often necessitate an enlargement of time to comply with
2 a court deadline. *Id.* Extensions of time “usually are granted upon a showing of good cause, if timely
3 made.” *Creedon v. Taubman*, 8 F.R.D. 268, 269 (D. Ohio 1947). The good cause standard considers a
4 party’s diligence in seeking the continuance or extension. *See, e.g., Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations,*
5 *Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 609 (9th Cir. 1992).

6 **III. DISCUSSION**

7 Defendants’ deadline to file their dispositive motion is today, September 17, 2019. As the
8 deadline has not yet expired, Defendants must therefore demonstrate good cause for the requested
9 enlargement. Good cause exists to enlarge the time for Defendants to file their motion because their
10 counsel has been recently employed with the Office of the Attorney General and needs additional time to
11 evaluate the case; contact Defendants regarding potential defenses; and obtain possible declarations in
12 support their possible defenses.

13 Additionally, counsel has been assigned many cases wherein dispositive motion deadlines have
14 been pre-set and counsel has not had the required time to familiarize himself with the matter prior to filing
15 dispositive motions. Such is the case in the instant matter.

16 Defendants are seeking this enlargement in good faith and not for the purpose of any unnecessary
17 delay. Moreover, Defendants do not perceive any possible prejudice to Plaintiff if this motion is
18 granted. Therefore, Defendants request to be allowed up to and including Thursday, October 17, 2019,
19 to file their motion.

20 ///

21 ///

22 ///

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

IV. CONCLUSION

2 As stated, Defendants need additional time to file their dispositive motion based on their
3 counsel's inability to timely complete the motion due to his recent assignment to the case. Accordingly,
4 Defendants respectfully request this Honorable Court grant their motion and allow them up to and
5 including Thursday, October 17, 2019, to file their motion.

6 DATED this 17th day of September 2019.

AARON D. FORD
Attorney General

By:

HARRY B. WARD, Bar No. 11317
Deputy Attorney General

Attorneys for Defendants

IT IS SO ORDERED
Hall
U.S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I am an employee of the Office of the Attorney General, State of Nevada, and that on this 17th day of September, 2019, I caused to be served a copy of the foregoing, **DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME TO FILE A DISPOSITIVE MOTION (Second Request)**, by U.S. District Court CM/CEF Electronic Filing on:

Heriberto Toribio-Ruiz, #86947
Care of NNCC Law Librarian
Northern Nevada Correctional Center
P.O. Box 7000
Carson City, NV 89702
lawlibrary@doc.nv.gov

Caitie Collins
An employee of the
Office of the Attorney General